

REMARKS

The Official Action of May 10, 2007, and the prior art cited and relied upon therein have been carefully studied. The claims in the application remain claims 1-6, and these claims define patentable subject matter warranting their allowance. Favorable reconsideration and such allowance are respectfully urged.

Claims 1-6 remain in the application for consideration.

In response to the Examiner's rejection of claim 1 under 35 U.S.C. §112, first paragraph, Applicant has amended the specification and Fig. 2 to describe and identify the claimed "seats" as element 8. Applicant respectfully submits that this rejection has now been overcome.

The Examiner has further rejected claims 1-4 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being anticipated by Mulvey '032 in view of Elliott '316, and claims 5 and 6 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Mulvey in view of Elliott further in view of Haggler '214. Applicant respectfully traverses both of these rejections as applied to independent claim 1 as amended.

The basis for the amendment to claim 1 is found on page 5, lines 18-19 of the specification.

Applicant first notes that Elliott is very similar to the prior art illustrated in Fig. 1 of the application. Elliott teaches a hole for the intake and delivery valves made by a single boring operation. In this situation the intake conduit has necessarily the same diameter of the delivery conduit.

Further, in Elliott, both valves must be inserted during mounting of the pump from the opposite side with respect to the plunger.

Mulvey, even if it has the intake valve positioned in front of the line of the cylinders, does not teach the cylinders being within a single block formed as a unit together with the seats of the valve, the conduits and the manifolds, as noted by the Examiner.

Applicant submits that Elliott does not teach the mounting of the intake valve through only the cylinder before inserting the plunger therein. Even if the skilled man would have thought of mounting the intake valve through the cylinder before inserting the plunger in Mulvey, it would not have been possible. Such an operation would be prevented by the form of the housing 29 and by the fact that the housing 29 is open on

the side opposite from the piston, therefore, there is no stop for the intake valve if inserted in such way. Only substantial modifications, not taught by the prior art, but only conceivable in hindsight, would have been necessary to mount the valve in the claimed way.

Applicant further submits that the claimed configuration permits the use of a conduit 80 from the delivery manifold having a smaller diameter than that of the prior art which allows increasing the mechanical strength of the pump. As explained at page 4, lines 14-16 such a solution allows for a more robust connection between the cylinder head and the delivery conduit which is not taught by the prior art. This solves the problem of possible cracks and fractures that can affect the pump when working at high pressure, for example 300 bar or more. Also, there is no need to use stainless steel which is costly, but brass may be used for pump construction.

Applicant respectfully submits that the claimed invention patentably defines over the cited prior art combination on the basis of the structural differences identified above.

The prior art documents made of record and not relied upon have been noted along with the implication that such documents are deemed by the PTO to be insufficiently


Appln. No. 10/777,627
Amdt. dated August 6, 2007
Reply to Office Action of May 10, 2007

pertinent to warrant their applications against any of
applicant's claims.

Favorable reconsideration and allowance are
earnestly solicited.

Respectfully submitted,

BROWDY AND NEIMARK, P.L.L.C.
Attorneys for Applicant(s)

By 
Norman J. Latker
Registration No. 19,963

NJL:ma
Telephone No.: (202) 628-5197
Facsimile No.: (202) 737-3528
G:\BN\C\Corr\Fabbri4\Pto\2007-08-06 Amendment AF.doc